

SECRET

(Microfilming)

1. PROBLEM:

Determine whether future deposits of inactive records in the Records Center should be microfilmed and destroyed in lieu of expanding the Records Center to accommodate hard copy storage.

2. FACTS BEARING ON THE PROBLEM:

- a. The present capacity of the Records Center is sufficient to accommodate 41,220 cu. ft. of records.
- b. As of 1 January 1957 there were 32,395 cu. ft. of records on deposit at the Center.
- c. An estimated 15,300 cu. ft. of records will be deposited in the Center during the next twelve months. During the same period 3,300 cu. ft. will be destroyed. Thus, the net increase on hand at the end of the year will approximate 12,000 cu. ft.
- d. At the above rate the Center will be filled to capacity about 1 October 1957.
- e. Of the 12,000 cu. ft. net increase during the next twelve months, 8,200 cu. ft. consist of records which lend themselves to microfilming. That is, they are inactive records to which occasional reference could be made in film form. Or, if necessary, paper prints could be made from the film. They could all be filmed on a high speed rotary type camera.
- f. The remaining 3,800 cu. ft. consist of materials which should not be considered for microfilming. They are NIS's and other intelligence publications being held for supplementary distri-

SECRET

bution, records on loan from other agencies, IBM cards, and large or bound materials that could not be filmed on a high speed camera.

g. The costs of microfilming 8,200 cu. ft. of records (16,400,000 images) would amount to \$19.00 per cu. ft. or a total of \$155,800.00. See Appendix A for details of microfilming costs.

h. Thirty-two people would be needed for the microfilming operations in order to maintain a production rate equal to the rate of deposit. The salaries of these people are included in the cost figures noted above.

i. Records Center costs to store 8,200 cu. ft. of records in hard copy form for ten years (estimated average life) would amount to only \$2.60 per cu. ft. or a total of \$21,320.

j. The relative costs of microfilming versus Records Center storage should remain fairly constant for the foreseeable future. That is, the cost of microfilming will remain about seven times the cost of Records Center storage (\$19.00 per cu. ft. for the former and \$2.60 per cu. ft. for the latter).

### 3. DISCUSSION:

a. The Agency is faced with a dilemma. The Records Center will be filled to capacity near the end of September. Because of the President's request that new federal construction be held to essential minimums the Agency does not want to undertake expanding the Center at this time. Microfilming of future deposits would greatly reduce their bulk and forestall the need for expanding the Center. But, microfilming would cost more than seven times the cost of Records Center storage.

- b. Furthermore, if microfilming were resorted to, thirty-two new people would be required to perform necessary operations. How can this be reconciled with the expressed wish of the President and of Congress that personnel ceilings be held at present levels?
- c. When the excessive costs of microfilming are considered it would seem that expanding the Records Center would be the better way out. However, are there any other solutions? Could rented space be obtained as a temporary measure to accommodate the supplemental distribution materials (approximately 11,000 cu. ft. of NIS's and other intelligence publications)? It would be quite a job to move this many records and to change the voluminous location indexes. A better solution would be <sup>to</sup> obtain rented space and move in new deposits of ~~in-~~ active records since such a move could be accomplished gradually.
- d. The cost of rented space would raise the cost of storing one cu. ft. of records for ten years to approximately \$10 ~~per year~~. This is still much cheaper than microfilming costs, but almost four times as much as Records Center storage costs.
4. CONCLUSIONS:
- a. Microfilming is too expensive to consider as a substitute for Records Center storage even as a short term substitute.
- b. Expansion of the Records Center would cost little more than one fourth the cost of the next best solution to the problem of storing inactive records, i.e. using rented space.

3. This next best solution, the rental of storage space, should not be used as anything more than a temporary expedient.

Its use for more than one or two years would be too costly.

-4-  
SECRET

*BEST COPY  
Available*

6/17/98

## APPENDIX A

### Costs of Producing 100 ft. of Records (2000 frames) on Microfilm

Raw stock film (70 ft.)	\$1.56
Film developing @ \$1.50 per 100 ft.	1.05
Camera operation (2 hr. 40 min. @ \$1.21 per hr.)	4.84
Preparation of records for filming, including indexing devices (4 hrs. @ \$1.81 per hr.)	7.24
(connecting film, labelling cartons, making retakes and splicing (40 min. @ \$1.81 per hr.)	1.21
Camera and reader rental	.80
Supervision (pro-rated cost of two GS-7 supervisors, one in charge of records preparation and one in charge of camera operations plus pro-rated cost of one GS-11 general supervisor)	2.00
Contingencies (floor space, clerical supplies, electricity, etc.)	.30
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$19.00</b>

These costs do not include any costs incidental to recruiting, hiring, or indoctrinating personnel.